

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims have been added, amended, or deleted in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-29, 31-37, 39-41, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dodrill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,901,431)

Claim 1 recites that a method for dynamically developing a user interface in an existing software application comprises, *inter alia*, invoking a user interface developer component for creating the user interface during the execution of the software application from within the software application, identifying one or more fields to include in the user interface, associating a field type for each of the identified one or more fields, associating the user interface with a function of the software application, and generating the user interface when the associated function is triggered based on the user interface definition file during the execution of the software application.

Dodrill discloses that a gateserver 70 provides access for a browser based XML editor tool 56b that enables a web programmer to design voice applications by editing XML pages (col. 8, lines 25-28). In particular, a user of browser 56 sends a request to the application server 66 to create or modify an XML document, which causes the application server 66 to generate a form specifying the contents of an XML document 100 upon which a user can perform different operations (col. 9, lines 30-52). For example, as shown in Fig. 4, a user can insert various parameters and entry fields into the XML document for display (col. 9, line 53 – col. 10, line 26). Thus, even lacking programming skills or knowledge of XML syntax, a user can personalize a voice-enabled web application defined by XML documents by

accessing default XML documents, modifying the default documents using form 102, and posting the form 102 back to the application server 66 (col. 10, lines 40-45).

Dodrill further disclose that the application server 66 includes a runtime environment 224 for execution of parsed XML documents (col. 10, lines 66-67). The runtime environment 224 includes a tag implementation module 230 for implementing an XML menu page and the tag operations specified within stored XML documents (col. 11, lines 6-17). As shown in Fig. 7A illustrating a method of executing a voice application, the application server 66 receives an HTTP request specifying a user identity and a voice application operation, such as to enable a calling party to leave a message for a user or to initiate message retrieval by the user (col. 12, lines 27-48). If the application server 66 identifies a user-specific XML document associated with the HTTP request, it accesses the user-specific XML document, executes the document, and dynamically generates an HTML page, which is output to a web browser for execution of the voice application operation (col. 12, line 55 – col. 13, line 31).

In contrast to claim 1, Dodrill fails to disclose or suggest invoking a user interface developer component for creating the user interface during the execution of the software application from within the software application. Rather, as discussed above, Dodrill discloses modifying a default XML document to create a customized voice-enabled web application separately and independently from the application, not during the execution of the voice-enabled web application from within the voice-enabled web application. In other words, to create a customized voice-enabled web application (by creating a user-specific XML document for the application), the user does not execute the voice-enabled web application and then invoke the XML document modification routine during the execution of the application. Rather, the user must modify the XML document to create the user-specific XML document independently from the execution of the voice-enabled application.

Further, since the application is a voice-enabled application, such as for leaving messages or retrieving messages with a telephone (see, e.g., Fig. 1, user devices 18, and col. 6, lines 8-50), the voice-enabled application is only executing when a caller accesses the application with a telephone. Clearly, the telephone does not enable the user to create a user

interface or allow a user to invoke a developer component for creating the user interface during the execution of the voice-enabled application via the telephone. Rather, Dodrill specifically discloses using a web browser 56 to modify and create the user-specific XML document. Accordingly, for all of these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Dodrill.

Claims 2-5 and 7-8 are also patentably distinguishable from Dodrill by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 9-13, 15-21, 23-29, 31-37, 39-41, and 43 are patentably distinguishable from Dodrill for reasons analogous to claim 1.

Claim 42 was rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dodrill. Claim 42 is patentably distinguishable from Dodrill by virtue of its dependence from claim 1, as well as its additional recitations.

Lastly, claims 6, 14, 22, 30, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dodrill in view of Lewallen (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,224). As discussed in the Amendment filed on January 31, 2006, like Dodrill, Lewallen fails to disclose or suggest invoking a user interface developer component for creating the user interface during the execution of the software application from within the software application, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, even if combinable, claim 6 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dodrill and Lewallen by virtue of its dependence from claim 1. Claims 14, 22, 30, and 38 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dodrill and Lewallen for reasons analogous to claim 1.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment,

to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7/13/06

By Man Wark Reg. No. 43,250

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

by William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 26,874